DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 337 SP 031 006

AUTHOR Arch, Elizabeth C.
TITLE Using Research Knowledge To Improve Teacher Education. Final Report. Part I.
INSTITUTION Lewis and Clark Coll., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 29 Sep 88
CONTRACT 400-85-11065
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS General Education; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Masters Degrees; Masters Programs; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Research Utilization; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Lewis and Clark College OR

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this project, initiated at Lewis and Clark College, Oregon, was to identify the most valid, reliable, and salient research findings on teaching, learning, and teacher education, and to use those findings in the development and implementation of revised preservice and inservice programs. Particular areas of current research were identified and teams were established to analyze that research and provide specific recommendations for program modification. A central philosophy and set of teacher competencies was developed out of the recommendations to guide subsequent changes. A new model master of arts in teaching program was developed, and the old preservice and inservice sequences were modified to reflect the common approach. An extensive assessment procedure was installed to monitor the move towards more effective teacher preparation and provide direction for continued improvement. This report discusses each step of these processes in detail. Program assessment instruments are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305337

Final Report

Using Research Knowledge to Improve Teacher Education

Contract Number 400-85-11065

Part I

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Lewis and Clark College
Dr. Elizabeth C. Arch, Acting Project Director
September 29, 1988

SP031006

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Final Report

Using Research Knowledge to Improve Teacher Education

Contract Number 400-85-11065

Part I

Lewis and Clark College
Dr. Elizabeth C. Arch, Acting Project Director
September 29, 1988

Liberal arts colleges can play an important role in attracting strong candidates to the teaching profession by offering them a rich liberal arts education and a personalized research-based professional training. Lewis and Clark College has for over fifty years provided teacher preparation within a liberal arts context. Before the project funded by the grant from the United States Government Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the Teacher Education Program consisted of a preservice elementary and secondary certification sequence for undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students, and an inservice Master of Arts in Teaching and advanced certification component. As part of the funded project, these offerings were changed to reflect current research on effective teaching and the training of effective practitioners. In addition, a fifth-year preservice Master of Arts in Teaching program was developed to improve teacher education and the quality of teaching in public high schools.

Lewis and Clark College was in a particularly favorable position to implement substantial program changes in response to the current critiques of teacher education and the extensive research literature on effective teaching. The college has been continuously accredited by the State of Oregon since its inception, with the largest number of certification areas (17 secondary endorsements plus elementary education), and the largest number of teacher education graduates of any Oregon private institution. It is recognized throughout the state and region for producing excellent graduates (as evidenced by an unusually high placement record), and for having a research-oriented faculty. Recently the college eliminated the elementary education major, requiring both elementary and secondary certification-seeking students to complete a major in an academic discipline other than education. In addition, the Teacher Education Program was placed within a newly created Graduate School of Professional Studies which, as a small, relatively autonomous unit, could provide greater flexibility for altering program structure and content. This move, plus the considerable faculty turnover during the time, created an atmosphere of change which dramatically facilitated the extensive program review, revision and assessment which represent the major results of this project.

The primary objective of the project funded by the OERI was to identify the most valid, reliable, and salient research findings on teaching, learning, and teacher education, and use those findings in the development and implementation of revised preservice and inservice programs. To accomplish this task, particular areas of current research were identified, teams established to analyze that research and provide specific recommendations for program modification, a central philosophy and set of teacher competencies developed out of the recommendations to guide the subsequent changes, a new model Master of Arts in Teaching program developed to operationalize that philosophy, the old preservice and

inservice sequences modified to reflect the common approach, and an extensive assessment procedure installed to monitor the move towards more effective teacher preparation as well as provide direction for continued improvement. All aspects of the project have been completed, with surprisingly little deviation from the original objective or from the original set of recommendations which arose out of the research literature. Each step of the process will be discussed more extensively below.

I. Review of the Research Literature

During the initial stage of reviewing current research on effective teaching and effective teacher preparation in order to develop specific recommendations for program modification, the teacher education faculty selected three areas of research for particular study--classroom management, language arts instruction, and research on the education of teachers. These areas were selected for several reasons: 1) they represented needs expressed by beginning teachers in a statewide questionnaire conducted by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission; 2) they fit with particular concerns of the Lewis and Clark College Professional Education Programs Consortium regarding the structure of teacher education programs; 3) they were seen by the teacher education faculty as particularly salient topics, given recent advances in understanding the processes involved in those areas and the fundamental nature of that knowledge for producing effective teachers.

The research committees were carefully constructed to provide a diversity of perspectives and begin the collaborative effort which was to characterize the entire project. They included representation from elementary, secondary, and higher education, from several subject fields, and from three school districts. Once the teams were established, the college faculty team members reviewed the research and provided between fifteen and twenty articles and/or chapters for the public school team members to read. Discussions of these readings served as the basis for developing a position paper on best available practices in each area. These papers included recommendations regarding curriculum and instructional components to be incorporated into the Lewis and Clark Teacher Education Program.

II. Recommendations

The following recommendations emerged from the position papers and served as the basis for the philosophy statement adopted by the faculty to guide the subsequent program modification. The program should be designed and organized to:

1. emphasize more extensive subject and professional education, such as is possible in a fifth-year program, in order to reduce narrow specialization;

2. have a community-based collaborative model of teacher education where the various institutions interested in teacher preparation are organized in new ways in order to be more effective in the preparation process;

3. view the teacher not as a technician who simply needs skills in transmitting knowledge but as a professional decision-maker, a reflective practitioner, who is prepared for the broad educational, social and political responsibilities of the profession as well as the selection and implementation of effective methods in the classroom;

4. attract students of diverse backgrounds who are life-long learners desiring expertise and the development of the whole person at whatever stage in their career they happen to be, and who are committed to having an impact on the direction of education in this country;

5. use expert teacher models, and encourage students to possess a repertoire of skills and abilities;

6. have a meaning-making focus where learners are actively engaged and cognizant of their own knowledge and strategies (metacognition). The student-centered approach has the teacher as an enabler, a facilitiator, who can encourage learning in his or her students. This includes a whole language approach to reading and writing--a model of literacy which is meaning-centered, emphasizing purposeful communication and the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;

7. emphasize the effective integration of management and instructional strategies within a specific context as a means of enhancing the achievement, motivation, responsibility and creativity of various students. This includes a broad set of skills which incorporate factors related to personal relationships, classroom climate, organization, instruction and discipline;

8. address the concerns of professionals in many areas who must understand and accommodate personal and organizational elements which affect their professional activities.

In sum, "Lewis and Clark's teacher education programs must model those attitudes, ethical standards, and procedures which we want to see develop in the schools. Teacher education must become increasingly scholarly, rigorous, research-based, democratic,

participatory, student-centered, humane and effective" (Research Report on Teacher Education).

III. Modification of programs

The second step of the project was the modification of current programs in response to the recommendations from the research reports. The philosophy statement containing the key intellectual assumptions for the entire program served as the primary guide for the various components as they evolved. First, a list of competencies which represented the desired knowledge and skill outcomes for the preservice education sequences was carefully constructed. Then the certification-only preservice program, which had served undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students exclusively in the past, was modified to reflect the new direction provided by the research review and application. The required sequence was changed to tighten the coordination of the course work and practica around the competencies. The student teaching experience was structured explicitly to achieve the knowledge and skill outcomes which are desired, with both the college faculty and the public school cooperating teachers encouraged to focus their supervision on those specific aspects of effective teaching. The accompanying seminar was similarly focused, and the assessment process tightly tied to evaluating the attainment of the competencies. The effectiveness of these changes will be discussed below with the results of the assessment process for the third year of the project.

The inservice program was also modified to focus more explicitly on the educational theory and practice which would most enhance the understanding and abilities of teachers in the field. However, less emphasis was placed on this particular program than on the two preservice elements. The faculty plans to make the in-service professional sequence a particular focus for examination and modification in the coming year.

IV. Development of the Master of Arts in Teaching Preservice Program

The Master of Arts in Teaching Program for preservice teachers which was developed under the grant combines study of the liberal arts with coursework to obtain certification and a professional degree.[1] The program was developed to respond to several themes in reports of prestigious national commissions and professional associations calling for changes in the structure and content of teacher education. It differs from earlier MAT programs in its explicit commitment to strengthening collaboration between school site and

[1] Much of the following presentation of information about the MAT Preservice program is based on the document "Teaching matters: A report on the first year of the new Lewis and Clark Master of Arts in Teaching program." prepared by Andra Makler, January 1988.

college, and in its focus on critical analysis and development of curriculum. The program also combines elements of more traditional MAT programs in its efforts to attract older students with solid grounding in their academic disciplines. In its emphasis on possibilities for change within schools, and in its philosophical commitment to encouraging highly motivated and competent beginning teachers to work with at-risk students in urban schools, the preservice MAT program attempts to bridge the gap between critiques of public education and calls for reform.

The research-based model teacher education program which was developed features: collaboration of college and public school faculties in the planning and implementation of the program; college-based and field-based learning; the integration of liberal and professional education; and a program of study which combines broad areas of professional education into a cohesive investigation of the purposes of schooling, student development and learning, the analysis of subject matter knowledge, models of teaching, curriculum construction, the integration of reading and writing, and knowledge of self as a teacher. In addition, as an institution, Lewis and Clark College is committed to furthering intercultural and international understanding, balanced exploration of the perspectives, traditions and contributions of men and women, understanding of the role of science in human and intellectual life, and reflection upon the ethical and moral dimensions of a diverse community in an interdependent world. These priorities also are central to this new teacher education program.

The MAT program was initiated the second year of the funded project with 8 students who were preparing to teach language arts and social studies at the secondary level. After extensive review at the end of the first year the program was modified, and subsequently enrolled 15 students for the year which is just finishing. This second year of the program was perceived by all as more organized and effective, as would be expected. Further changes in course sequencing and content have been instituted for the coming year. In addition science and elementary MAT degree sequences have been started. Thus the entering class for the third year consists of 7 language arts, 8 social studies, 2 science, and 9 elementary education candidates.

The program itself extends for 15 months, with students completing 60 hours of graduate work in liberal arts, education, and professional courses. It meets the state requirements as a fifth-year graduate teacher education program leading to both certification and an MAT degree. The program was initially limited to those candidates who were interested in teaching secondary social studies and language arts but has since been expanded to include science and elementary education. The secondary sequence is one of only three in the state which have been approved by the state Teacher Standards and

Practices Commission under new and more stringent standards for teacher preparation programs. To earn the MAT degree, candidates enroll in at least one liberal arts course for four of the five quarters, even if they have completed all subject area requirements for certification as undergraduates. Then, a "core" of common coursework in education and professional studies is required of students in all the certification areas. Since this model of teacher education uses progressive involvement in school-based experiences to help prospective teachers apply the theories of learning, curriculum design and instruction to the real world of the public schools, the program includes a nine-month internship under the guidance of a selected mentor with a reputation for excellence as a teacher. During that time, the interns progress from observation, to tutoring, coaching and small group work, to team teaching, and finally to complete responsibility for particular classes of their mentor teachers.

As a results of two years of practice and extensive evaluation by all participants, the program now consists of a summer term which includes Adolescent Development and Learning, Social/Historical/Ethical Perspectives on Education, a subject area elective, and a course on Individual and Societal Perspectives on Adulthood, the last taken with degree candidates from other professional graduate programs. During the fall term, students again take an elective in their subject area, plus Literacy and Ethnography, and Classroom Instruction and Learning which is split into two parts, one interdisciplinary across the MAT certification areas, the other by subject matter discipline. The internship and accompanying seminar involve 8 hours per week. In winter, another elective in the subject area is taken, with a course on The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum, and the internship and seminar for approximately 10 hours per week. Spring term consists exclusively of the teaching practicum where interns assume full responsibility for their classes. The final term in the summer includes a course on Researching Teaching Goals and Strategies, a seminar to integrate Experience and Meaning, another subject area elective, and the second course with students from other programs which considers issues of concern to professionals in general, this time on Organizational Cultures. Some students must take additional credit hours for their subject area endorsement.

To qualify for admission to the program, students must hold a B.A. degree in an appropriate discipline, demonstrate a 3.0 GPA on their undergraduate transcripts, pass the C-BEST test, take the National Teachers Examination in their subject field, write an application which includes a statement of their reasons for wanting to teach and discussion of a current educational issue, and present three written recommendations. As a group they differ from most preservice teaching candidates in the following ways: they are older, they have worked at a variety of jobs, they share an interest in social justice and often

demonstrate an active involvement in community groups which work for social change. In the first and second years of the program, all students received stipends from participating school districts as part of their internship. These stipends will be available for future cohorts as well. However, with the increasing number of students in the program not all will be able to receive this financial assistance.

One major emphasis of the new program is a commitment to meaningful school-college collaboration. Involvement of public schools has included close working relationships with administrators and teachers in the planning and placement process. For example, a metropolitan school district approved paid internships for the students and agreed to work collaboratively with the college faculty to select high-quality mentor teachers. An even closer working relationship was established with one suburban district, the third largest in the state, where there were extensive discussions concerning program development and goals. A half-time staff member from that district's personnel office was assigned to work with the Lewis and Clark Teacher Education Program to coordinate internships and student teaching placement, to supervise students, and to assist the mentor teachers with whom the students were involved. That district also offered paid internships.

The strong commitment of these local districts to collaborative teacher education is particularly evidenced by the attention which they have given to placement. All school districts involved with the program have selected school building sites according to the perceived strength of the departments where interns would be placed, and have consistently nominated exemplary teachers. Criteria for selecting mentors include a minimum of five years' teaching experience and a Masters degree, agree to work with an intern for the full 9-month period, and write a formal application describing their orientation to teaching and their qualifications as a mentor. They must also agree to attend the year-long series of Mentor Teacher Seminars where the theory and practice of supervision and the special nature of the mentor/intern relationship are discussed with the college faculty. Literature distributed to interested teachers expresses the underlying philosophy of the program in order to attract those who have a similar view of education.

The teachers who have worked as mentors cite the following motivations: to improve the quality of teaching in schools and/or the quality of the profession; to improve "the standing of teaching in the community;" for intellectual stimulation; to provide a context for reflection upon their own teaching; because the money Lewis and Clark offered was "better than in other programs;" to obtain new ideas about methods of teaching and curriculum; to get in on "the ground floor" and shape a new program; and as an antidote to the isolation of teaching. They also were attracted by the possibility of "some sort of a

connection" to the faculty of Lewis and Clark. All echoed the mentor who said he felt "a personal stake in wanting to have good people in the school system."

The master teachers who agreed to serve as mentors for the interns during the first two years of the program worked with Lewis and Clark faculty to refine the curriculum and design appropriate college and field experiences. These teachers received a stipend for their work. Although the stipend does not reflect the actual value of the mentor's work during the year, the money was substantial enough, in comparison to the honoraria usually offered to cooperating teachers, to symbolize the program's efforts to recognize the importance of mentors' contributions. It may not be possible to continue this attractive incentive; however, all participants will be awarded 2 quarter hours of continuing education credit for attending the Mentor Teacher Seminars. They will also receive tuition for a Lewis and Clark course of their choice, and hold an appointment to the Lewis and Clark faculty which entitles them to use the college library free of charge. There is also the possibility for some of teaching with college faculty in courses and at the seminars which support the apprentice teachers during their full-time teaching experience.

V. Critique

At the end of the first year, one of the program faculty members conducted an extensive evaluation of the MAT program as part of the research for her doctoral thesis on the way mentor teachers conceptualize their role. She conducted interviews with the mentor teachers, as well as with the curriculum vice principals and central office administrators at the schools where interns were placed. She participated in extensive discussions with the mentors, interns, and program faculty. In addition, the interns submitted written evaluations of the program, and were themselves evaluated by their mentors. From this feedback, she identified several areas of concern. These were addressed by changes in the program for the second year and also for the third year to come, yet they remain sources of continued stress.

a. Placement of the interns. For the initial year, a pool of mentor teachers was selected before the interns arrived to begin their studies; there were more mentors than interns. At a picnic that August, all mentors met with interns, faculty, and deans from Lewis and Clark for a sociable introduction to the program. When school began in September, interns traveled in groups to observe classes of all the mentors, prior to expressing their preferences for a specific one. The mentors indicated considerable discomfort with this procedure because they felt they were on display.

In the second year, selection of mentors was delayed until after the start of the school year in the fall. Also, to make the process more of a two-way procedure, mentors also

specified their preferences, after meeting and talking with interns. Then, in arranging the matches, consideration was given to mentor and intern preferences, the match between intern's college major and mentor's teaching assignment, and availability of transportation to suburban schools. With this arrangement, the mentors were less uncomfortable than the interns, who became anxious to start their involvement at their school sites as quickly as possible. Fortunately, all placements except one worked out well.

For the third year, the districts requested that the interns be placed in the spring prior to entry. This will permit interns to be in the schools earlier--including teacher orientation in the fall--and will reduce the anxiety which mentors felt during the fall observation process. The disadvantage is that interns will not get to see their mentors teach before placement. However, it has been made clear to both interns and mentors that if the matches do not work there will be "no-fault separations."

b. Recruitment of the students. The size and strength of the applicant pool has increased with each year of operation. By the second year all those who came had strong, although varied, backgrounds. One withdrew because of personal problems, and another one had academic difficulties and may not be certified. (One reason for this is that he continued a part-time job during student teaching.) The current class looks very strong. Three factors, two positive and one negative, may impact the future success of the program in recruiting excellent candidates. As originally established, the program is a 15-month sequence for each cohort. Occasionally students have been allowed to stretch the program over two years which has turned out to work well. As of the coming year, this is being offered as a regular option. When students choose this option, they take subject matter courses the first year and core and education courses with the cohort group. This has several advantages for some students who, for financial or academic reasons, may not otherwise be able to participate: it permits them to continue part-time jobs; it gives them a chance to move back into the academic life more gradually; and it provides an opportunity to associate on campus with both prospective and experienced teachers and to test their commitment to education as a career.

The second positive factor is the move by the state towards fifth-year programs (with an emphasis on receiving a masters degree) for all beginning teachers. This will encourage more and more candidates to opt for this avenue for certification, and generate increasing interest in our offerings as one of the few programs currently available in the state. However, there is a negative aspect to this new emphasis in the state as well. As an intensive full-time commitment for 15 months, the program requires the students to have financial resources which may not be available for many people. Because of the innovative nature of this program, the local school districts have been able to provide stipends which

alleviate part of the burden for the students. As more colleges and universities offer similar programs, the districts may not be able to continue to provide this assistance. Given the dearth of scholarship and grant funds for graduate training (we do have a grant to support science students for the next two years), financial concerns will become increasingly important in recruiting qualified students.

One last point on recruitment: In response to a national need, one particular commitment of this program was to recruit minority students. Despite sending recruitment material to a large number of minority colleges, the response has been minimal. There was one Hispanic student in the second year class, and two minority students starting currently. Unfortunately, there are no financial resources available specifically for minority students at this time.

c. Sequencing of courses and course content. After the first year both mentors and interns raised issues related to the sequencing of courses and course content. While the public schools are on semesters, the College is on quarters, necessitating considerable juggling to meet the various requirements of the program within the schedules for the schools. The mismatch in calendars was experienced as a shift in expectations by all concerned as the students began new terms at the College when the mentors and high school students were finishing up prior work. Plans to re-order the sequence of courses for the third year may ease the organizational strain imposed by the differences in academic calendars, and make it possible for interns to spend a steadily increasing and consistent number of hours at their schools. The College is also considering shifting to the semester system, effective in 1990, which will bring the college calendar in line with the schools' academic year.

However, it is likely that some concern about scheduling will continue. As each intern's undergraduate coursework is different, each has a different academic schedule to meet certification requirements. Interns cannot arrive at the school site at the same time every day during Fall and Winter quarters because the college schedule of coursework does not permit this regularity. For high school teachers accustomed to the routine of the school day, this is an inconvenience. It is an area of uncertainty which requires them either to allot part of their attention to keeping track of changes in their intern's schedule or to resign themselves to not always knowing when interns will arrive. Either way, mentors find themselves somewhat off-balance. Some, even when they were regularly informed about their intern's commitments at Lewis and Clark, continued to regard their interns' appearances at school as irregular.

The students and mentors have provided specific feedback about the sequence of courses, resulting in substantial restructuring of the program. In the second year in

particular they expressed concern because they wanted/needed more time both in the schools and in their on-campus courses. As a consequence, courses have been moved around to try to get a better balance in each of the five terms. The Adolescent Development course was moved to the first summer to make room for methods in the fall. And the Literacy and Ethnography course was scheduled in the fall to support student observations and provide background for tutoring in reading. A research course was eliminated and the material integrated into the Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum,which is the only education course winter term. The effect of this is to move more of the academic work into summer and fall and thus provide time for a gradually increasing involvement in the schools.

d. The internship. Because of the nature of the program, one of the major issues is the internship. After the first year, the mentors reported that they had sufficient information about program goals, values, philosophy, and generally desired outcomes, but inadequate guidelines for the internship. Interns and mentors, especially during the fall term, had been less productive than anticipated because neither knew how best to use the time interns spent in schools. College faculty seem to have assumed mentors would know what to do, while mentors presumed that it was the college's responsibility to set the agenda for its students. Although mentors and MAT faculty were philosophically committed to "collaboration," no attempt was made to articulate explicit responsibilities. This is not unusual in school-college partnerships; in the traditional student teaching period, cooperating teachers often are left on their own to oversee the prospective teacher's inductions into the profession.

During the second year, the activities of the interns were more carefully structured by the college faculty, and these expectations specifically communicated to the mentors during the Mentor Teacher Seminar. This alleviated much of the anxiety in this area. However, the mentors still reported that, because of the length of the internship, they tended to put off some of the issues which they felt were important to discuss or experience in preparation for teaching until it was too late in the year to cover them adequately.

e. Mentor/Intern relationship. The relationship which developed between the intern and mentor was complex, and problematic at times. One source of difficulty was the fact that some of the interns were older than typical student teachers. As a consequence, their mentors described their relationship as more personal than with younger students; for some this was a bonus; for others, it produced discomfort. The mentors were also unprepared for the discomfort they experienced when their interns made mistakes -- their interns were competent adults but not yet competent teachers. This disparity in experience produced a disparity in coping behaviors, which mentors found disconcerting. In general, the length of the internship intensified the mentors' commitment to the intern's successful

completion of student teaching. It also made them more aware of "intern-anquish," and gave the interns more time to anticipate the complexity of the spring term responsibilities and therefore become more anxious.

f. Relations with students. The year-long internship required the mentors to forego more of the contact with their high school students than short-term student teaching does, and thus deprived them of some of the satisfaction they derived from teaching. The mentors noted that their students tended to resent the withdrawal of the mentor from the classroom. In addition, it was often difficult for the intern, who had been working more as a friend and observer of the students for two-thirds of the year, to be accepted in the role of teacher during the spring term.

g. The Mentor Teacher Seminars. During the first year the mentors were displeased because they had expected there to be a new and different kind of collaboration between the public school teachers and the college faculty, particularly in the mentor teacher seminars where a "real dialogue" about teaching would occur among the participants. They found the format, where the college faculty asked the mentors to read and respond to articles about teaching, to be more like a typical graduate school class. As a consequence, the mentors responded rather passively to the invitation to participate in making decisions about intern teachers' curriculum, or in establishing expectations for the internship. The result was frustration on the mentors' part because they did not feel they were an integral part of the program, and frustration on the part of the college faculty because they were not able to engage the teachers and profit from their rich expertise and insights about teaching and schools.

The second year, the college faculty provided a clearly articulated set of guidelines for mentoring and for intern participation in the school sites, including specific dates by which interns should have accomplished certain activities in their school sites. Much effort was also expended to make the seminars useful for the mentors. They tend to be a difficult group to please -- partly because they are busy and partly because they have some anxiety about their role. A specific curriculum was developed for the seminars which included discussion of the mentor role, appropriate benchmarks for interns to complete, case presentations by the mentor/intern pairs of a particular dilemma of teaching, practice with clinical supervision, and issues of face-to-face conferencing. The mentors are also asked (as are the interns) to keep journals of their experience, including recording data about the interns' progress, their own concerns, and the ways in which resolutions were fashioned between themselves and the intern. As a result, the seminars have become gradually more participatory, and mentors' response more positive.

h. Summary. In sum, although all participants believed that the year-long internship makes the Lewis and Clark program "stronger" than typical teacher education programs, the mentors experienced the internship as energy-intensive, time-consuming, and "more work than I have ever done before." It is obviously important to organize recruitment of mentor teachers in early spring for the next year to facilitate planning and collaboration with the school sites. Mentors must be helped to plan ways to coordinate their multiple responsibilities, set aside time for talking with their interns, and still reserve some time for their own private reflection and renewal. It is also important for all concerned to acknowledge the uncertainties produced by the new role of mentor. There is a difference between knowing what and how to teach public school students and knowing how to mentor graduate student interns. The mentors looked to the college faculty for assistance in understanding the expectations for the role, and in helping them to acquire the skills needed to be good mentors. They themselves were reflective about their own practice, and had high expectations that the program would provide them with the means for their own professional development. There is a continuing sense among those who mentor and the college faculty that even more can be accomplished. Yet the process of collaboration is not easy. Mentors still feel as if they are not really "part of" the program. There needs to be further exploration of the meaning of collaboration to participants in this new endeavor, along with efforts to develop more effective structures for collaborative decision-making.

Overall, however, the mentors feel that the Lewis and Clark students complete the program well prepared. Interns are seen as competent in their teaching discipline (although their preparation did not always correspond to the immediate needs of the mentor's teaching assignment) because the year-long internship provides more opportunity for them to study and prepare the materials for the time when they have to assume full responsibility for the classes. The mentors are also impressed by interns' willingness to work hard, and by their creativity and ability to engage students in "active learning." Specific data concerning the mentors' and the interns' responses to the program are considered below.

VI. Assessment of effectiveness of the revised Lewis and Clark Teacher Education Program

As part of the work under the OERI grant, an assessment procedure has been developed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Teacher Education Program as it has been modified which includes attention both to the process of becoming a competent beginning teacher and the product of the program's efforts. The philosophy statement and the set of specific competencies which emerged out of the research literature focus the Program in general. These are presented to students when they first enter and the students asked to indicate their current sense of how well they understand each competency (See Appendix A

for the Initial Responses to Competency Areas form. This assessment tool has been given for the first time to the new cohort in the MAT program, June 1988). Students are then asked to indicate after each class how they evaluate the extent of their knowledge and skills in the competency areas and what aspects of the class had an impact on their development (See Appendix B for the Course Evaluation: Assessment of Position on Competencies after Instruction form. This instrument will be used as the evaluation form for all preservice professional courses beginning in the fall, 1988). Thus students will know from the time of entry what outcomes are desired and will have ample opportunity to reflect on the process of acquiring each outcome as they move through the Program. In addition, their reflections will provide the faculty with a basis for examining, in general, how the formal knowledge of the Teacher Education Program is transmitted and incorporated by prospective teachers.

The Program outcomes are also incorporated into new evaluation forms which were first used at the conclusion of the student teaching or internship experience this last spring to assess the effectiveness of each sequence. These forms include a final student teacher or intern evaluation, an evaluation of their program by the elementary and secondary certification-only and the MAT students, and an evaluation of the program by the public school personnel who supervised (See Appendix C). Analyses of the ratings and comments from these instruments reveal the extent to which each sequence is attaining the objectives. This will provide the basis for any subsequent modification of the Program which might be necessary to engender the desired competencies in prospective teachers more effectively. Summary data for students who completed their student teaching or internship this last spring, and the conclusions which can be drawn from that information, are contained in the accompanying paper prepared for presentation at the 1989 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting.

COMPARISON OF STUDENT ATTAINMENT OF TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN TRADITIONAL PRESERVICE AND FIFTH-YEAR MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING PROGRAMS

Teacher education is currently receiving wide-spread attention in this country. A series of national reports have addressed the sad state of the teaching profession and proposed a variety of solutions to this critical problem (Carnegie Task Force, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). However, the recommendations for the improvement of teacher education which have appeared in those reports and in the various professional responses to them are sufficiently diverse, and each supported by sufficiently valid arguments, to indicate that before any major change in the preparation of teachers is instituted, extensive research is needed to determine whether any one recommended solution is superior to the rest in preparing effective beginning teachers.

In particular, the Holmes report urged that, to be truly professional, all teacher preparation should occur at the graduate level in conjunction with a master's degree program (Holmes, 1986). While it seems plausible that such a change will improve teacher education, there is little actual evidence to support that claim. Some critics have proposed instead that it is the quality of a program which is critical and that improving traditional preparation programs may be more defensible and economical (Tom, 1986). Others have questioned the value of a master's degree for beginning teachers and suggest that basic preparation can precede experience in the schools with opportunities provided after 2 or 3 years to return for greater depth within a master's degree program. Given that the reforms recommended by the Holmes group will be costly, it seems desirable to determine whether a preservice master's degree program does in fact make a difference to beginning teacher effectiveness (Hawley, 1986). The purpose of the study presented here is to evaluate two models of teacher education, a traditional certification-only and a fifth-year Master of Arts in Teaching program, to determine their effectiveness in producing desirable outcomes in preservice teaching candidates.

The Programs

Originally, the teacher preparation program at a small liberal-arts institution in the Pacific Northwest consisted of a single rather traditional preservice certification sequence available to undergraduates and a few post-baccalaureate students. Upon receipt of a three-year grant from the U.S. Government Office of Educational Research and

Improvement, the program faculty began an extensive process of evaluation and modification of the preservice offerings. The first step was a review of the current research on effective teaching and the training of effective practitioners. This was done in collaboration with representatives from the public schools who were also interested in identifying important issues in teacher education and effective means of preparing beginning teachers. The resulting focus, expressed in a new philosophy statement for the program, was to make teacher education increasingly scholarly, rigorous, research-based, democratic, participatory, student-centered, humane and effective. The general recommendations out of the research which guided the subsequent program changes are given in Figure 1. The specific competencies which were identified as encapsulating the characteristics of effective teachers and thus desired outcomes of a teacher preparation program have formed the basis of the evaluation process which provided the data for this study.

As a result of the review of the research literature, a fifth-year preservice Master of Arts in Teaching program was developed in secondary Language Arts and Social Studies which incorporated the recommendations for effective teacher preparation and for improving the quality of teaching in public high schools. The program is a 15-month sequence which combines professional education courses with liberal-arts study for 60 hours of graduate work. Collaboration between college and public school personnel supports an intensive nine-month internship in the schools which accompanies the coursework. Like previous MAT programs, this one is designed to attract older students with solid grounding in an academic discipline. However it differs from those programs by emphasizing collaboration between college and secondary school, and the critical analysis and development of curriculum. In addition, the program emphasizes the possibility for change within public schools and the commitment to working with at-risk students. Program participants, as part of their internship, receive a stipend from the school districts in which they are placed. The public school mentors also receive a stipend from the college, which is more substantial that the honoraria usually offered to those who supervise student teachers. In addition they receive continuing education credit for participation in the mentor seminars which are an integral part of the program, tuition for one course, adjunct faculty status, and a library card.

After two years of practice and extensive evaluation by all participants, the program now consists of a summer term which includes courses in Adolescent Development and Learning and Social/Historical/Ethical Perspectives on Education, a subject area elective, and a graduate "core" course on Individual and Societal Perspectives on Adulthood taken with degree candidates from other professional graduate programs. During the fall term,

Figure 1: General Recommendations for Improving Teacher Education

The program should be designed and organized to:

1. emphasizes more extensive subject and professional education such as is possible in a fifth-year program in order to reduce narrow specialization;
2. have a community-based collaborative model of teacher education where the separate institutions interested in teacher preparation organize in new arrangements to be most effective in the preparation process;
3. view the teacher not as a technician who simply needs skills in transmitting knowledge but as a professional decision-maker, a reflective practitioner, who is prepared for the broad educational, social and political responsibilities of the profession as well as the selection and implementation of effective methods in the classroom;
4. attract students of diverse backgrounds who are life-long learners desiring expertise and the development of the whole person at whatever stage in their career they happen to be, and who are committed to having an impact on the direction of education in this state and elsewhere;
5. use expert teacher models, and encourage students to possess a repertoire of skills and abilities;
6. have a meaning-making focus where the learner is actively engaged and cognizant of their own knowledge and strategies (metacognition). The student-centered approach has the teacher as an enabler, a facilitiator, who can encourage learning in his or her students. This includes a whole language approach to reading and writing--a model of literacy which is meaning-centered, emphasizing purposeful communication and the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;
7. emphasize the effective integration of management and instructional strategies within a specific context as a means of enhancing the achievement, motivation, responsibility and creativity of various students. This includes a broad set of skills which incorporate factors related to personal relationships, classroom climate, organization, instruction and discipline;
8. address the concerns of professional in many areas who must understand and accommodate personal and organizational elements which affect their professional activities.

students again take an elective in their subject area, Literacy and Ethnography, and Classroom Instruction and Learning which is split into two parts, one interdisciplinary across the MAT certification areas, the other by subject matter discipline. The internship and accompanying seminar involve eight hours per week. During December, students teach for three weeks, teaming with their mentors and/or alone. Then in winter term, another elective in the subject area is taken, with a course on The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum, and the internship and seminar for approximately ten hours per week. Spring term consists exclusively of the teaching practicum where interns assume full responsibility for the classes at their school site. The final term in the summer includes a course on Researching Teaching Goals and Strategies, a seminar to integrate Experience and Meaning, another subject area elective, and the second "core" course with students from other programs which considers issues of concern to professionals in general, this time on Organizational Cultures (see Appendix). Some students may take additional credit hours for their subject area endorsement.

The original certification-only preservice sequence was also modified to reflect the clearer focus provided by the research review and application. It was carefully restructured to achieve the same specific set of competencies: the required sequence was changed to tighten the coordination of the course work and practica around the competencies; the student teaching experience was structured explicitly around the specific knowledge and skill outcomes which are desired with both the college faculty and the public school cooperating teachers encouraged to focus their supervision on those specific aspects of effective teaching; the accompanying student teaching seminar was similarly focused; and the assessment process tightly tied to evaluating the attainment of the competencies.

Currently the secondary certification-only sequence consists of 38 quarter hours. This includes an introductory course with extensive field experience, adolescent psychology, educational psychology, social foundations of education, verbal and visual literacy, an instructional strategies course which includes five weeks of structured and unstructured experiences in the school in which the student will student teach the subsequent term, and the student teaching term. Practica are included in almost all foundation courses. Students have an opportunity to take most of the courses at different times and in somewhat different order with only the final strategies class and student teaching taken as a sequence under the same professor by each cohort. The elementary certification-only sequence is more extensive because of the state mandated requirements in various subject area methodologies, equaling 45 quarter hours of foundation and method classes, and 15 of student teaching. The majority of the students take the methods courses in the fall and

winter terms prior to spring term student teaching. Thus they are members of a tight cohort group which share the same experiences under the guidance of the same few professors.

Methodology

Subjects

The Teacher Education Program is open to all students who desire teacher certification in the state. Applicants must have at least a 2.5 GPA for the certification-only sequence, or 3.0 for the MAT program, and an extensive grounding in the academic subject area in which they wish to teach at the secondary level, or an academic major plus breadth of subject area coverage for elementary teaching. For the newly developed preservice MAT program, emphasis was placed on attracting older students, well grounded in their academic disciplines who shared the program's committment to change in public education. Many had worked at a variety of jobs; some had been actively involved with working for social change prior to entry. 15 finished their student teaching for the preservice MAT program in secondary social studies and language arts. 16 students completed the secondary certification-only program at the end of the same term--7 social studies, 5 language arts, 2 math, 2 foreign language, and 1 art. 13 additional students completed the certification-only preservice elementary education sequence in the spring, with one other student extending his student teaching into the fall for a total of 14. Thus most of the students in this study were involved in coursework and practica during the year prior to the collection of data, although a few of the certification-only students extended their teacher preparation over a slightly longer period.

Procedure

The major data to be discussed here were collected at the end of spring term, 1988, as most of the certification-only and MAT students completed their student teaching and were evaluated by their public school supervising teachers on their attainment of a specific list of 15 competencies characteristic of effective teachers. The final student teacher evaluation forms are routinely sent out to the supervising teachers toward the end of the term, and when returned are placed in the students' permanent placement files that are used for job application. The rating scale on the forms range from 1 (Low Competence) to 5 (Exceptional Competence) for each competency, with an opportunity to indicate if the competency was not observed or was judged as not applicable to the teaching role being evaluated (NA). A scale to indicate a final summary rating of the student's overall performance in comparison to "other student teachers," or to "others who are completing

their initial teaching experience" for the MAT students, is also included along with a space for comments.

All the students and their supervising teachers were also asked to evaluate the teacher education program on the extent to which it successfully accomplished the goal of providing the knowledge and skills required to be a competent beginning teacher. These program evaluation forms used a three point scale of Very Successful(VS), Successful(S), and Not Successful(NS) with NA available to indicate that the respondent feels the particular competency is something that cannot be taught in a teacher education program. For the students, the form elicits two responses for each competency, one for whether the program "provided an understanding of what that competency means and why it is important (the **Theory**)", and another for whether the program "provided the knowledge and skills to be effective in the classroom in that area (the **Practice**)". The form for the public school supervisors does not distinquish between theory and practice. All forms include a summary rating to indicate the overall assessment of the program's performance in preparing the student. The scale here is 1 (Poor) through 3 (Satisfactory) to 5 (Very Good). Space for written comments is included with each competency, and with the summary rating. The program evaluation instruments were administered to the secondary student teachers and interns during regularly scheduled meeting times. The forms for the supervisors and the elementary student teachers were sent through the regular mail with return envelopes enclosed to encourage completion. While the return rate was quite good for the supervisors, there was no way to distinguish between the elementary and secondary certification-only teachers, making it necessary to combine the evaluation results for these two groups. The elementary student teachers were not very responsive and the few forms that were returned have not been used in this analysis.

Results and Discussion

It is possible that these different programs attract very different types of candidates. Given that not all individuals are equally suited to teaching, or to a specific approach to this complex profession, it is necessary first to examine basic demographic information about the students in the different programs to determine as best as possible whether there are differences which may confound the interpretation of the results. Information about age, sex, and academic ability and experience was obtained from the files for all candidates and is summarized in Table 1.

These data indicate some interesting differences and similarities among the students enrolled in the programs. There are more young undergraduate women in the elementary program, which is not surprising. However at the secondary level, many students in the

Table 1. Demographic information on students in programs for Certification-Only Elementary and Secondary and Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary

	Elementary CO (N=14)	Secondary CO (N=16)	MAT (N=15)
Sex - % female	79 (11)	63 (10)	27 (4)
Level - % graduate	36 (5)	69 (11)	100 (15)
Age			
Mean	26.6	29.6	32.0
Mean for graduates only	32.0	32.8	32.0
Median	26	25	33
Range	22-40	21-46	25-41
Undergraduate GPA - Mean	3.26	3.3	3.3
Graduate GPA - Mean	3.72(5)	3.52 (11)	3.60 (15)
# Graduate credits - Mean	48.4(5)	40 (10)	55.3 (12)
CBEST	(N=14)	(N=15)	(N=12)
Reading			
Mean	54.3	60.2	62
Median	49	60	64
Range	39-80	45-76	53-70
Math			
Mean	59.4	60.1	57.2
Median	58	64	56
Range	42-79	20-79	39-75
Writing			
Mean	42.6	47.9	51.5
Median	47	47	50
Range	39-75	29-63	41-63
Total			
Mean	161.7	168.5	170.4
Median	157	171	166
Range	136-205	97-203	155-189

Undergraduate colleges for graduate students:

Elementary:	Cal. St, Bethal, Lewis & Clark, WSU, Univ.Portland
CO Secondary:	Univ. Kansas, WSU, Lewis & Clark(2), Evergreen, OSU, Portland St.(2), Univ. Nevada, Middlebury, Queens
MAT Secondary:	Western Wash, Oregon St, Lewis & Clark(3), Central Wash, Portland St.(3), Wilmington, Wash.St., Univ. Oregon, Mt.Holyoke, Gonzaga, Vanderbilt.

certification-only program, like the MAT students, are college graduates and older, although more of them are women (55%). The MAT program with its internship requires graduate students to have the resources and time to be more than just full-time students for a fifteen-month period. The certification-only program, being a less intensive, more flexible program is attractive to post-baccalaureate students who cannot or do not want to make that kind of time commitment, who already have a master's degree, or who have completed some education coursework or experience and therefore do not desire all the components included in the MAT program.

Summary information about the academic achievement of the students indicates little differences between the groups: the means for both undergraduate and graduate GPAs are similar, as are the undergraduate institutions of the post-baccalaureate students. All these students appear to be academically able. One difference is that most of the post-baccalaureate students were credited with completing the majority of their subject area course work prior to entering the program and therefore only enrolled in professional courses. The MAT program includes subject area courses which serve to round out or deepen the students' knowledge in various areas of the curriculum they might be teaching. Thus their graduate GPA includes subject area courses as well as professional preparation.

The CBEST scores for the elementary group are somewhat lower on the reading and writing sections while the mean scores for the MAT group are higher in those areas. The certificate-only group has a wider range of scores than the MAT students with both more low and more high scores. There was one very weak art post-baccalaureate student in the secondary certification-only program who did not pass the CBEST, and was only barely credited for student teaching. Without her scores, the mean CBEST scores for the graduate certification-only students are almost identical to those of the MAT students (Reading: 62, Math: 59.7, Writing: 48.6, Total: 170.2). The data on GPA and CBEST suggest that, on average, the post-baccalaureate students seeking initial certification for teaching at the secondary level had similar levels of basic academic abilities and achievements. The mean scores for the 5 graduate students in the elementary program remain lower than those of the other groups (Reading: 56.6, Math: 53.6, Writing: 44.6, Total: 154.8). However, for that group as well as the other two, there is no consistent relationship between CBEST scores and how effective they were judged to be on their final student teaching evaluation.

Table 2 summarizes the data from the final student teacher evaluation forms completed by the supervisors in the public schools. Most of the ratings in the elementary certification-only and the MAT secondary programs are 4s and 5s, indicating a high level of competency as a whole for those two groups of students. The

Table 2: Number of preservice MAT and certification-only secondary and elementary teaching candidates receiving from their cooperating teacher or mentor ratings of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 (5 high) in each competency area on the Final Student Teacher Evaluation Forms. (Some supervisors left one or more scales unmarked, or indicated NA.)

Competency Area	Cert.-only Elementary (N=14)				Cert.-only Secondary (N=15)				MAT Intern Secondary (N=14)			
	1-2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
Knowledge												
1. Subj. Area K.	1	1	2	10	1	4	6	4	0	0	4	10*
2. Translate K	1	1	2	10	1	2	4	7	0	2	8	4
Instruction												
3. Plan Curriculum	1	1	4	8	0	4	5	6	1	1	5	7
4. Engend.Stud.Interest	1	1	1	11	1	4	1	8	0	1	6	7
5. Variety of Techniques	1	1	4	8	0	3	4	8	1	2	2*	9
6. Connect to Prior K.	1	1	3	9	0	3	5	7	0	1	9	4
7. Enhance Cog. Abil.	1	2	3	8	1	3	2	8	0	2	6*	6
8. Foster Indep. Learn.	1	2	1	10	2	2	4	7	0	3*	3	8
Evaluation												
9. Assess and Feedback	1	1	5	7	0	4	2	9	0	0	7	7*
Individual Differences												
10.Attend to Indiv.Diff.	0	2	4	8	0	4	1	9	0	1	4	9
Management												
11.Manage class	2	1	3	8	1	4	5	5	0	3	8*	3
Interpersonal Relations												
12.Relate to all	2	0	1	11	0	2	3	10	1	0	3	10
13.Encourage Pos.Inter.	1	2	0	11	0	4	4	7	0	1	3	10*
Professionalism												
14.Dev. Ed. Phil.	1	1	2	10	0	4	3	7	1	0	6*	6
15.Reflective	1	1	2	10	0	2	4	9	1	0	3	10
Summary Rating	1	2	1	10	0	3	2	8	0	1	4	9

* One intern had two mentors. The data reflect the ratings of the mentor in the student's primary subject matter emphasis. The * indicate that the other mentor rated the student one number higher, or in the case of a 5, one lower.

certification-only secondary has more lower ratings than the other two. Examination of the individual forms for the students reveals that, while there may be an occasional lower rating (3 or less) for those who are otherwise consistently high, most of the 1-3 ratings on the different competencies are for a few individuals who tended to be weaker overall. In the elementary program there was one student who was very weak, two others who were not strong, and one who extended the student teaching experience into the subsequent term and exhibited such growth during that time as to receive a very strong evaluation. For the latter student, the high final evaluations mask the additional effort which was required but do indicate the attainment of the competencies at a high level. For the secondary certification-only program there were two candidates who were notably weaker that the others, including the one art student mentioned above, and two who received mixed ratings. For the MAT group, only one was notably weak, with one other receiving more mixed ratings.

Thus, most of the lower ratings are the result of these few particular individuals and do not provide much information about the effectiveness of the programs. While more care in admissions leads to fewer weak candidates, even that is no guarantee of 100% success: no program can make all students into effective beginning teachers. It is also the case that these evaluation forms are to be placed in students' placement files. Supervising teachers are reluctant to jeopardize the careers of those students with whom they have been involved. Given the tendency to rate students highly for public purposes, it is worth examining the 4 and 5 ratings closely here to determine whether there are any difference which are indicative of the supervisors distinguishing "very satisfactory" and "satisfactory" preparation of the majority of the students from a program.

In examining primarily the 4 and 5 ratings, it is evident that the elementary students were more likely to be highly rated on the competencies than either of the secondary programs. Only one competency, Assessment (9), has as little as 50% of the students in that program receiving the highest rating. The certification-only secondary program not only had a larger number of weaker students, but also had fewer being rated by their public school supervisor as exceptional (5) in their attainment of the competencies. The competencies where these students were least likely to be rated highly are Subject Area Knowledge (1), Curriculum Planning (3) and Management (11). The first is not surprising since the post-baccalaureate students in this program may not have had subject area courses for many years, yet did not need to take current classes unless their previous transcripts indicated significant gaps in breadth of coverage. Curriculum planning is also difficult when you do not have a

grasp of the conceptual framework of the discipline in which you are teaching. This grasp comes with considerable time and experience. Even the majority of the MAT students, in the program which emphasized curriculum planning, were not rated exceptionally successful in the eyes of the supervising teachers, although the interns expressed satisfaction with their theoretical preparation to do so. (See below) Greater differences in ability to plan between the two secondary groups may be more apparent after a year or more of actual teaching. The third area, Classroom Management, is also difficult without extensive experience. This has traditionally been a problem for beginning teachers, as well as a source of considerable anxiety. A separate class on management is being added to the secondary certification-only and elementary sequence to develop more skill and encourage confidence. However, this may not be a competency that is amenable to satisfactory preparation prior to actual full-time teaching--interns with more extensive experience in the classroom were also not likely to be rated highly in this area. The majority of the secondary certification-only students were highly rated in three of the instructional competencies (4,5,7), Assessment (9), Attending to Individual Differences (10), Relating to all (12), and Reflection (15).

The MAT program produced students who were particularly likely to be rated highly in Subject Area Knowledge (1), Interpersonal Relations (12,13) and Reflection (15). It is interesting that while being knowledgable in their subject areas, they did not tend to be rated as excelling in Translating Knowledge (2) for their students, or in making Connection to Prior Knowledge (6). As one mentor noted "Most college students start out at the college level and must realize that they must come down to the high school level." This too may be an area for secondary teaching which simply requires more actual teaching experience. What would need to be examined is whether those who have greater knowledge in their beginning teacher preparation are able to develop the ability to perform this competency expertly more rapidly and/or to a greater extent . The majority of the MAT students also were rated highly for presenting a Variety of Techniques (5), Fostering Independent Learning (8) and Attending to Individual Differences (10), all particular emphases of that program.

It is instructive to compare the results above to the anonymous, non-public program evaluations completed by the public school supervisors and the students. Table 3 presents the data for the supervisors. While these data are not as useful as they would be if it were possible to separate the responses by elementary and secondary level, or to correlate the ratings of the program with the ratings of the specific students the supervisors used to judge the programs, there are still some interesting results. Looking first at the certification-only programs, it is clear that the supervisors made a more critical assessment

Table 3: Number and percentages of cooperating teachers and mentors rating the program Not Satisfactory (NS), Satisfactory (S) or Very Satisfactory (VS). (Percentages in parentheses may not add to 100 if respondents indicated the competency area was not applicable, or left the rating blank)

Competency Area	Cooperating Teachers Elementary and Secondary (N=25)			Mentors (N=11)		
	NS	S	VS	NS	S	VS
Knowledge						
1. Knowledge of subject area	6(24)	7(28)	11(44)	0	5(42)	6(55)
2. Appropriate translation of knowledge	4(16)	8(32)	12(48)	1(9)	7(64)	3(27)
Instruction						
3. Plan and present curriculum	4(16)	10(40)	10(40)	1(9)	5(45)	4(36)
4. Engender student interest	3(12)	8(32)	13(52)	1(9)	6(55)	4(36)
5. Variety of instructional techniques	5(20)	6(24)	14(56)	0(0)	4(36)	7(64)
6. Connect material to prior learning	6(24)	10(40)	9(36)	1(9)	4(36)	5(45)
7. Enhance cognitive abilities	4(16)	11(44)	8(32)	2(18)	4(36)	5(45)
8. Foster independent learning	3(12)	11(44)	10(40)	1(9)	8(73)	2(18)
Evaluation						
9. Assess achievement	3(12)	11(44)	10(40)	0(0)	5(45)	5(45)
Individual Differences						
10.Attend to individual differences	1(04)	9(36)	15(60)	1(9)	6(55)	4(36)
Management						
11.Manage class effectively	6(24)	10(40)	9(36)	0(0)	9(82)	2(18)
Interpersonal Relations						
12.Relate positively to all	1(04)	6(24)	15(60)	0(0)	4(36)	7(64)
13.Encourages positive interactions	2(08)	10(40)	13(52)	0(0)	6(55)	5(45)
Professional						
14.Develop an Ed. Phil.	5(20)	6(24)	10(40)	1(9)	6(55)	4(36)
15.Reflective	2(08)	5(20)	17(68)	1(9)	4(36)	6(55)
Summary rating	**2**	**3**	**4** **5**	**2**	**3**	**4** **5**
	3(12)	5(20)	1(4) 15(60)	1(9)	0	5(45) 4(36)

on these forms than on the evaluation of the student teacher: there are fewer of the highest ratings of Very Satisfactory than the exceptional ratings (5) for the students, and more Not Satisfactory ratings than might be predicted from the lowest ratings of 1 and 2 for the students. However, most of the same competencies where students from both the elementary and secondary programs were more likely to be highly rated on the student teacher evaluation form (Table 2), have the majority of supervisors rating the programs Very Satisfactory (4,5,10,12,15), indicating general program strength in these areas. Only Competency 7, Enhancing Cognitive Abilities, was rated lower by more of the supervisors that would be expected from the other form. Most significantly, on the summary rating, 60% of the supervisors indicated that they considered the program to be "very good." Given the instructions on that scale, to give an "overall assessment of the program's performance in preparing your student teacher," it appears that, even though some areas were seen as needing improvement for a particular individual, the supervisors were well satisfied with the program.

For the MAT program, the majority of supervisors rated the program as they had the students, as Very Satisfactory in the competency areas Knowledge of Subject Area (1), Using a Variety of Techniques(5), Relating Positively to All (12), and Reflection (15). Fostering Independent Learning (8), Attending to Individual Differences (10) and Encouraging Positive Interactions (13) are not as positively rated here as on the student forms--there are more Not Satisfactory ratings than might be predicted from the number of the ratings of 1 and 2 on the student forms--and the mentors tend to be more critical in their summary evaluation of the program. Comparison across the programs is difficult, of course. But, while it is apparent that the elementary and secondary certification-only programs have more Not Satisfactory ratings, they do not overall have a lower percentage of Very Satisfactory rating either. It might be expected from the pattern seen on the final student teaching evaluation forms that the lower ratings here would be primarily from teachers at the secondary level and the higher from those supervising elementary students. However, examination of the individual program evaluation forms that could be identified as being from elementary or secondary teachers do not indicate this to be the case. Obviously more data is required before any very specific conclusions can be drawn.

Turning finally to the student evaluations of the programs summarized in Table 4, only the ratings for the two secondary groups are available. In general, for both programs, the students rated their program higher in providing them with an understanding of the theory than of how to implement the practice. Both programs were almost universally perceived by the students as at least satisfactorily covering the theory aspect, with only Translating Knowledge (2), Curriculum Planning (3) and Relating to All (12) for the

Table 4: Number of secondary Student Teachers and Interns who rated the program Not Satisfactory (NS), Satisfactory (S), or Very Satisfactory (VS) on each of the competency area. For Competencies 2-13, students were asked to rate the program in terms of how well it helped them feel competent in both the **theory** and the **practice**. (In a few cases a student indicated the competency area was not applicable to their preparation, or left the rating blank)

Competency Area		Student Teachers (N=15)			MAT Interns(N=15)		
		NS	S	VS	NS	S	VS
Knowledge							
1. Subject Area Knowledge		5	8	2	2	5	8
2. Translate Knowledge	Theory	2	5	8	1	4	9
	Practice	2	9	3	3	11	1
Instruction							
3. Plan Curriculum	Theory	3	7	5	0	5	10
	Practice	4	7	2	1	9	5
4. Engender Student Interest	Theory	0	6	9	0	5	10
	Practice	2	8	5	3	6	6
5. Provide Variety	Theory	1	6	8	0	4	11
	Practice	1	7	7	0	8	7
6. Connect to Prior Learning	Theory	0	10	5	2	3	10
	Practice	1	9	5	3	6	6
7. Enhance Cog. Abilities	Theory	0	6	9	0	6	9
	Practice	0	9	6	2	8	5
8. Foster Independent Learn.	Theory	1	6	7	1	5	9
	Practice	3	7	3	1	10	4
Evaluation							
9. Assess Achievement	Theory	0	7	8	3	7	5
	Practice	2	5	8	3	9	3
Individual Differences							
10. Attend to Individual Diff.	Theory	0	7	8	1	4	10
	Practice	2	8	5	2	6	7
Management							
11. Manage Class	Theory	1	8	6	1	6	8
	Practice	3	7	5	2	8	5
Interpersonal Relations							
12. Relate to All	Theory	2	5	8	0	7	8
	Practice	2	6	7	1	6	8
13. Foster Positive Interaction	Theory	0	6	9	0	5	10
	Practice	2	6	7	3	3	9
Professionalism							
14. Dev. Educ. Philosophy		0	8	7	0	5	10
15. Reflective		0	5	10	3	0	10

Simmary Rating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	4	7	4	1	0	3(1+)*	7(3+)*	2

* The (1+) indicates that 1 student rated the program as a 3+, the (3+) that 3 students gave the program a 4+ rating.

certification-only group, and Connecting to Prior Learning (6) and Assessment (9) for the MAT students being rated by more than 1 student as Not Satisfactory. More students in the MAT program than in the certification-only sequence felt Very Satisfied in many of the competency areas, particularly Subject Area Knowledge (1), Planning Curriculum(3), and the theory of how to Provide Variety (5) and to Connect to Prior Learning (6). However, except for Curriculum Planning (3), the students in the two programs, overall, did not rate their sense of competency in "practice" all that differently. The fifteenth competency, Reflection, is interesting because the majority of students in both programs gave Very Satisfactory ratings, yet there were three Not Satisfactory ratings in the MAT program. Examination of the individual forms indicated some strong responses to the extent to which reflection was emphasized--as one student said "Almost too much! It's become an "in" joke within the program."

Comments from the certification-only group indicated that the students felt positive about their practical student teaching experience although they recognized they were not experts yet. They were most specific about the lack of adequate subject area knowledge. Interns were most likely to comment on the need for more practice, being quite satisfied with their theoretical knowledge. Examination of the individual forms did not reveal that the Not Satisfactory ratings were uniformly from the same individuals. Therefore, those that were rated more poorly by their supervisors were not necessarily the ones who felt dissatisfied with the program. Some of the same areas of strength and weakness of the two programs were apparent here as in the other forms, although more students were rated highly(5) by their supervisors in practice in the competency areas than felt very satisfied with their preparation for practice.

Summary and Conclusions

The results indicate that in general both options, the certification-only and the MAT, provided the majority of the preservice teaching candidates with satisfactory knowledge of effective teaching practices and ability to implement those practices in the classroom. From the data for the secondary teaching candidates, attainment of the theoretical knowledge was perceived as greater than the practical skills. It is also apparent from the data that all sequences were able to encourage students to develop the capacity for reflection (Competency Area 15), a major goal of the Teacher Education Program as a whole.

Comparison between the programs indicates some differences in their impact, the most direct comparisons being possible between the certification-only and MAT secondary certification evaluations. The most critical difference is that the MAT program does have more students who were perceived by their supervisor as very successful in their student

teaching at the secondary level. Thus there is a stronger influence of the MAT program with its more intensive, coherent structuring where all students move as a cohort through the courses and practica experiences with strong peer support and socialization, and where there is the extensive exposure to the teaching and learning process in the public schools through the internship. Of course, some of the effect may be the result of differences in the admissions procedures of the two programs. While the two student groups did not differ substantially on the demographic variables, less careful screening in the certification-only program may allow individuals to enter the preparation process who are less personally suited to being a teacher. It is also possible that the differences were to some extent a result of differences in the selection process for the supervisors. Since the certification-only programs were not able to be as selective of the supervisors, and did not work with them as specifically to determine experiences and expectations for the students, the supervisors of some may not have been as supportive of the goals of the program, as effective in guiding those that were less strong initially, or as realistic in their assessment of what is possible for student teachers.

Looking more specifically at what in the program may have produced the stronger results, the fact that the elementary education certification-only sequence produced similar if not superior results to the MAT program on the student evaluation by the supervising public school teacher may support the conclusion that a coherent block of professional preparation which extends over several terms is more important for producing highly competent beginning teachers than the internship. However, there are several other factors to consider before drawing that conclusion. First, this group of elementary candidates was described as a particularly strong one--the positive results for such a high percentage of the students may not be reproducible, that is, attributable to the program itself. Data from another group of elementary students would help to clarify the impact of this one aspect of the training program. Second, since there are insufficient data from the other forms on the elementary candidates to use to verify the evaluations, the possibility that the elementary student teacher evaluations were generally less critical, or used a different basis for comparison, cannot be discounted. Again, more data is required. Finally, a common complaint among supervising teachers of the traditional student-teaching practicum is that their students are not able to experience the entire academic year and thus are not fully prepared to assume the role of a beginning teacher. Here, the mentors of students in the MAT program felt their students were better prepared because of the extended time with them. It may be the case that there are substantial other benefits from the internship that are not directly assessed by these particular evaluation instruments. Further study is obviously

necessary to separate the effects of the various components of this new model of teacher preparation.

A more fundamental difference between the programs may be what is important in the long run rather than the specific structuring of the experience. The thrust of most of the recommendations for improving teacher education gleaned from the research literature is that by providing preservice teachers with more subject area and professional knowledge, we will develop reflective decision-makers who are more effective at encouraging student learning. The MAT program clearly provides more extensive subject area education than does the secondary certification-only sequence for post-baccalaureate students (undergraduate students have more accessible knowledge from their recent college coursework). The impact of that is clear from the data: students are perceived as better prepared by themselves and their supervising teachers. In addition, the students perceive such grounding as necessary; MAT students were pleased with their knowledge while the certification-only secondary students who were post-baccalaureate felt the need for more such knowledge. Aside from the subject area knowledge, the MAT students receive a more coherent, intensive exposure to the theoretical basis for effective teaching, and report that they have a very strong understanding.

Given a stronger knowledge base, the issue becomes whether that translates into better decision makers who are more effective in encouraging student learning. The data suggest that this does <u>not</u> necessarily occur. Strong subject-area knowledge and a theoretical understanding of educational practice does not necessarily guarantee, during the student-teaching experience, appropriate subject area presentation for high school students, high satisfaction on the part of supervisors with the preparation for practice of education, or a sense of personal efficacy on the part of the students in implementing that practice. It may be possible that such skill is not possible to attain during preservice preparation. One of the teachers in the certificate program commented "Finding the ability levels of high school students may be a skill that develops over time. This item is a good argument for an intern teacher program where a teacher candidate can become acquainted with high school students on a long-term basis." However the interns here actually only taught for approximately one term, just as the certification-only students did. The rest of the year they were not necessarily engaged in translating their knowledge or developing their teaching skills because they were interacting with the students in other than an actual teaching capacity. Since there is a limit to how much time the intern can be teaching, given the needs and desires of the students and parents (the intern is not their regular teacher), those skills that require time in actual teaching may not be achievable at a high level during what is feasible for the student teacher or intern experience.

The fact that students in the certification-only sequence were able to function satisfactorily for the most part, as perceived by their supervisor, and to report rather similarly on their sense of efficacy in the classroom, lends support to the conclusion that there is only so much that can be accomplished in terms of acquiring the ability to implement complex teaching skills prior to assumption of a regular teaching position. However, before accepting that explanation, one alternative hypothesis needs to be considered. It is possible that the experience of the intern, and the mentor, is significantly different from that of a student teacher and supervisor, that the expectations of the mentor for what is feasible to accomplish are higher. The time the student spends in the classroom is longer. As a result, the evaluation criteria may be different--not what is possible within 10 short weeks, but what ought to result from a year with that teacher, those students, in that school--in, other words, a higher standard for a beginning teacher who is really not so beginning. If this explanation is correct, the MAT students may actually be considerably better than the certification-only group in the attainment of the competencies but are not any more highly rated because the standard to which they are being compared is higher. This possibility makes the comparison across programs very problematic. To determine more conclusively whether the two groups are equally or differentially effective in practice as student teachers requires objective data on the learning of their public school pupils. The state has now mandated the analysis of work samples during the student-teaching experience which will provide some of this information. In addition, a larger N and more complete feedback from the candidate and their supervisors on the other forms would provide more confidence in the conclusions.*

Even if the MAT and certification-only students <u>are</u> generally equal in their level of skill and sense of professional efficacy during their student teaching, it is very possible that students, such as the MAT interns here, who, during their preservice preparation, gain greater subject area knowledge and theoretical understanding of the process of teaching, are better able <u>subsequently</u> to develop the skills necessary to translating their subject area knowledge appropriately, and to teach most effectively. Thus it is most important now for determining the effectiveness of any teacher education program to obtain longitudinal data on the students' successes as beginning teachers, and as a contributors to effective teaching and change in the schools. Both information from first-year teachers to see whether

* One note of concern, these ratings are what the public schools use to determine who shall be hired. The consumers of this information would not distinguish between the meanings of the ratings for the one group versus the other, leaving the MAT students, despite whatever greater skills, knowledge and confidence they may possess, being compared to those who have lesser abilities but are evaluated as highly based on different expectations.

progress is swifter, and from later years to see whether skills are greater would be useful. Only then can final conclusions be attempted.

In summary, from the evidence above, supervisors and students, in both secondary teacher education programs at least, felt the program encouraged reflection and generally provided the competencies which are considered indicative of effective teaching at the level possible for beginning teachers. Yet clearly the interns as a graduate group had more knowledge of their subject area and more theoretical knowledge of effective educational practice, including a variety of models of teaching. If developing skill requires experience, it also requires a base of knowledge. The interns certainly have that while it is less certain for the secondary certification-only. It is possible that it is not the internship that is important, but rather a coherent, intense program with strong cohort support and socialization process. Further evaluation from the elementary program would provide some insight here. What the evidence here suggests is that the MAT program does accomplish its goals within what is feasible for a beginning teacher. The focus must now turn to documenting the development of skills as the students becomes full professional teachers. What still needs to be determined is whether the theoretical knowledge will translate into more effective teaching practices more quickly and to a greater extent. If that is the case, than a model of teacher preparation such as was developed here becomes the path to better education practice.

REFERENCES

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Carnegie Corporation.

Hawley, W.D. (1986). A critical analysis of the Holmes Groups' proposals for reforming teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. 37(4), 47-51.

Holmes Group Executive Board (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, Mi: Holmes Group.

Tom, A.R. (1986). The Holmes Report: Sophisticated analysis, simplistic solutions. Journal of Teacher Education. 37(4), 44-46.

LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
PRESERVICE MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING PROGRAM:
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND SOCIAL STUDIES

A Graduate Program of Study Incorporating Basic
Certification in English Language Arts or Social Studies
for Entry into Teaching at the Secondary Level

Summer I:

ED 550	Social. Hist.. & Ethical Perspectives on Educ. (3 QH)
ED 552	Adolescent Development and Learning (5 QH) (Includes practicum)
LA OR SS	Elective in subject area (3-5 QH)
CORE 501	Individual & Societal Perspectives on Adulthood (3 QH)

Fall Term:

ED 551	Literacy and Ethnography (4 QH)
ED 553.	Classroom Instruction and Learning I:
	A. Interdisciplinary (4 QH)
	B. By discipline (2 QH)
LA OR SS	Elective in subject area (3-6 QH)
CORE 500	Critical Issues (.5 QH) (Graduate core program weekend seminar)

(Internship and Seminar: approx. 8 hours/week)

Winter Term:

LA/SS 508	Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum (3 QH) (Cross-listed as SCI 508)
LA OR SS	Elective in the subject area (3-6 QH)
CORE 500	Critical Issues (.5 QH) (Graduate core program weekend seminar)

(Internship and Seminar: approx. 10 hours/week)

Spring Term:

ED 554.	Classroom Instruction and Learning II: Internship: Teaching Practicum (12 QH)

Summer II:

ED 500.	Researching Teaching Goals and Strategies (3 QH)
ED 555.	Experience and Meaning (2 QH)
LA or SS	Elective (3-5 QH)
CORE 502	Organizational Cultures (3 QH)

Minimum Required Program: 57 Quarter Hours

Subject area endorsements may require additional credit hours.

YEAR5\LASSPROG
12/7/88

APPENDICES

INITIAL RESPONSES TO COMPETENCY AREAS

The Teacher Education Program is designed to help you gain the understandings and skills required of an effective professional educator. The faculty has developed a set of competencies which it believes characterize the effective teacher, and a sequence of courses and practica which will give you the underlying knowledge and the skill to put that knowledge into practice. To facilitate your growth as a professional, we will ask you to reflect upon your own education in light of these competencies. On this initial response form, please take the time to write about your current knowledge of the issues involved with each competency. These responses can then be compared with the understanding you develop throughout your participation in the program. After each course, including field experience, we will ask that you review the competencies and write again. Your reflections will become part of your permanent file.

DIRECTIONS: For each competency area below, please rate yourself by circling the number that most closely matches your current ability in each area. Then detail the basis for that rating. To assist you, the descriptions below each general heading provide the key components of effective teaching in that area. Please use the back of the sheet and additional paper in order to provide a good indication of your current thinking about these issues

NAME (please print):_____ **Date:**_____

1. To what extent do you feel you know your subject field(s)?

To what extent do you feel that your knowledge is accurate, up-to date, and extensive enough so you can restate, illustrate, and explore within the field? Do you have a solid grounding in the basic concepts, theories and methods as well as the standards and values guiding inquiry? Do you have a sense of the changing nature of the field, of possible alternative interpretations, and of linkages to other fields and social concerns?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

2. To what extent do you feel you can translate your knowledge of the subject field(s) for the age and abilities of students you will be teaching?

To what extent do you feel you can break down the subject field into basic concepts, voacabulary, methods and generalizations, and then organize these clearly and coherently? Depending upon what the students currently know, will you be able to move from there to build new understanding? Can you connect the material of the field to the everyday experience of students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Litle		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

3. To what extent do you feel you can decide what to teach in a particular content area (such as geography, U.S. history, Algebra) and then develop and present the material of your field ("the curriculum") to achieve those goals?

To what extent do you feel you are able to decide what goals are appropriate to set for the age and ability of students, what methods will work best given how we learn, how to adapt content each day to be sure students learn, and how to adjust lessons when unexpected events occur and use these as opportunities to further your goals?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

4. To what extent do you feel you can engender student interest and involvement in the subject material?

To what extent do you feel that you will be able to use students' current knowledge and concerns, including those that are particular to their stage of development and those that are unique to their particular homes and community? Do you understand student culture, human development and social constraints on individuals and groups?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

5. To what extent do you feel you can use a variety of instructional techniques?

Do you feel you will be able to vary materials and activities within the time available in a manner that encourages student interest? Since students learn differently, will you be able to motivate learning through a variety of modes, including visual, aural, tactile, and kinesthetic?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

6. To what extent do you feel you can connect your current instruction to the prior learning of students?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to determine students' background knowledge, modify your instruction when necessary, review and summarize with students to help them successfully complete assignments, tests, etc?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

7. To what extent do you feel you can encourage the development of the cognitive abilities of all students?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to encourage creativity and higher order thinking? Can you use of reading and writing as well as questioning strategies in promoting a variety of levels of understanding?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

8. To what extent do you feel you can encourage the development of independent, responsible learners?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to model enjoyment of learning, provide opportunities for students to learn independently, help them to understand and direct their own cognitive processes, and then hold them responsible for their learning and behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

9. To what extent do you feel you can assess student achievement and provide appropriate feedback to students and parents?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to determine the standards by which you will evaluate student work, and then apply those standards consistently and equitably? Can you gather evidence about the effectiveness of your instruction in producing student learning through a variety of methods which are closely tied to your goals and methods of instruction? Will you be able to use feedback, particularly praise, to support learning, and to report achievement to students and their parents?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

10. To what extent do you feel you can accommodate individual differences among the students?

To what extent do you feel you understand the effects of differences in culture, social and linguistic background, gender, ability, learning style and development? Will you be able to adjust your instruction to accommodate these differences? Do you feel you will be able to maintain high expectations for all students and ensure that all aspects of your classroom uphold principles of sex equity, racial justice and "least restrictive environment" for the handicapped?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

11. To what extent do you feel you can structure your classroom to support learning goals?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to manage the classroom to ensure that students are attentive, cooperative, hard working, accurate, and thoughtful? Do you feel you can work with students to develop rules and procedures which work efficiently and effectively to support a norm of academic performance? Will you be able to respond consistently to misbehavior in a manner appropriate for the particular age of the students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

12. To what extent do you feel you can exhibit positive interpersonal relations with students, colleagues and parents?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to interact with students in a manner which is perceived as positive and inviting by the students themselves? Will you be able to use courteous, correct and non-discriminatory language? Do you feel you will be able to interact with colleagues and parents in an open, helpful and reciprocal manner?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

13. To what extent do you feel you can encourage positive interpersonal interactions among the students?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to insist on respect and appreciation for individual and cultural differences, and incorporate activities which will foster cooperation and collaboration? Will you be able to encourage students to be aware of the need for and actively work towards positive interactions and interpersonal harmony in the classroom group?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

14. To what extent do you feel you have a coherent educational philosophy which will encourage you to continue to be involved actively in this profession?

To what extent do you feel you will be able to tie your actions within a particular educational setting to a view of the more general purposes and goals of education? To what extent do you know professional sources of support and assistance, and have some sense of how you might work to improve the profession as well as your particular contribution to it?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

15. To what extent do you feel you are able to reflect consistently and constructively upon your decisions and actions?

To what extent do you feel that you understand the impact of the values which underlie knowledge in your subject field? Will you be able to see the world from the point of view of the students you teach? Will you be able to respond to the feedback of others and to assess your own knowledge, actions and reasoning to know where you are strong and where you need to improve, and be able to seek out new ideas and understandings to enhance your professional abilities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Little		Somewhat Adequately		Good ability		Excellent ability

Specific basis for rating:

Course Evaluation:
ASSESSMENT OF POSITION ON COMPETENCIES AFTER INSTRUCTION
(To be used in conjunction with the list of competency areas and descriptors)

Name:_____ **Date:**_____

Specific course or practicum name and number:_____

Directions: Please think carefully about this course in relation to each of the competency areas below and indicate whether this course or practicum affected your perception of your abilities in that area. Then rate your current view of your competency in light of where you started and where you believe you will end up, whether the course had an effect or not (we are interested in seeing how your sense of your abilities changes during the entire program). Finally, after each rating, if you found this course to be helpful, please explain/describe how and why this course increased your understanding and/or skills. Please be specific about what methods and content were particularly effective.

1. Did this course help you in any way to know your subject field(s)?
_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

2. Did this course help you in any way to translate your knowledge of the subject field(s) for the age and abilities of students you will be teaching?
_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

3. Did this course help you in any way to be able to decide what to teach in a particular content area (such as geography, U.S. history, Algebra, addition) and then to develop and present the material of your field ("the curriculum") to achieve those goals?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

4. Did this course help you in any way to be able to engender student interest and involvement in the subject material? _____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

5. Did this course help you in any way to be able to use a variety of instructional techniques? _____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

6. Did this course help you in any way to be able to connect your current instruction to the prior learning of students?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

7. Did this course help you in any way to be able to encourage the development of the cognitive abilities of all students. _____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

8. Did this course help you in any way to be able to encourage the development of independent, responsible learners?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

9. Did this course help you in any way to be able to assess student achievement and provide appropriate feedback to students and parents?
_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

10. Did this course help you in any way to be able to provide for individual differences among the students? _____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

11. Did this course help you in any way to be able to structure you classroom to support learning goals?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

12. Did this course help you in any way to be able to exhibit positive interpersonal relations with students, colleagues and parents?
_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

13. Did this course help you in any way to be able to encourage positive interpersonal interactions among the students? _____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

14. Did this course help you in any way have a coherent educational philosophy which will encourage you to continue to be involved actively in this profession?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

15. Did this course help you in any way to be able to reflect constructively upon your decisions and actions?_____Yes _____No

How would you rate your competency in this area now?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Low		Somewhat Adequate		Good		Excellent

Specific comments on the course:

Lewis and Clark College
FINAL STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

APPENDIX C

STUDENT TEACHER _____ Term/year_____
School_____
Grades/subjects taught_____ LC Supervisor_____
_____ Cooperating teacher_____

DIRECTIONS: Based upon performance that can reasonably be expected of a candidate in an initial teaching experience, please rank the competence of this student teacher, with 1 Low Competence....3 Average Competence....5 Exceptional Competence. Use the NA if the competency was not observed or is judged not applicable to the teaching role being evaluated.

THE STUDENT TEACHER: (Circle one)

1. Exhibits knowledge of subject matter. 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Presents accurate information in a variety of ways; makes reference to basic concepts, theories and methodologies; alerts to changing nature of subject field knowledge as well as linkages with other fields.

2. Translates knowledge of subject field(s) appropriately 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Builds vocabulary, concepts and methodological competence from students' current experience and level of understanding.

3. Plans and presents curriculum to achieve goals 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Determines and states goals; organizes activities, materials and methods of evaluation to achieve objectives; pace and sequence smooth; creative use of unexpected.

4. Engenders student interest and involvement 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Uses current student knowledge and concerns; designs activities which respond to developmental needs of students; takes account of effects of physical, social, and emotional climate of home and community.

5. Uses a variety of instructional techniques 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Includes a variety of methods and materials, both for interest and in recognition of varied learning styles.

6. Connects instruction to prior learning 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Includes frequent review and summary activities; monitors progress of student learning; uses feedback to adjust instruction.

7. Enhances cognitive abilities of all students 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Emphasizes higher order thinking in subject fields; models and promotes creativity and critical thinking; uses reading and writing as constructive processes underlying learning; uses questions effectively.

8. Encourages independent, responsible learners 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Encourages students to understand and direct own cognitive processes; models enjoyment of thinking and learning; fosters self-control in learning environment.

9. Assesses student achievement and provides appropriate feedback 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Uses various methods of formal and informal assessment; ties procedures to objectives; uses praise and other feedback to support learning; applies standards consistently and equitably; informs students and parents of student progress.

10.Attends to individual differences 1 2 3 4 5 NA
Displays appropriately high expectations for all; accommodates cultural differences; adjusts for exceptionalities; fosters appreciation of contributions of different genders, cultures, abilities.

(Low) (High)

11.Structures classroom to support learning goals 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Employs management methods that enhance on-task behavior; encourages attentiveness, accuracy, effort, reasoning, time on task, cooperation; responds to misbehavior consistently and appropriately; involves students in shaping rules and establishing norms to support academic performance

12.Exhibits positive interpersonal relations with students, colleagues, parents 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Displays positive, invitational behavior; is courteous and non-discriminatory; involves students in maintaining positive interpersonal relations; displays open, helpful, reciprocal relations with colleagues and parents

13.Encourages positive interpersonal interactions between students 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Insists on respect for differences; encourages intercultural, gender and group harmony; accommodates students with different social skills; incorporates collaborative learning opportunities.

14.Articulates a coherent educational philosophy and involvement in profession 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Refers to purposes and goals of education in planning and practice; has awareness of professional sources of assistance; articulates actions within wider context; committed to improving education and own professional abilities

15.Exhibits reflection 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Is aware of own strengths and weaknesses; displays understanding of students' conceptions of self, world, and subject matter; assesses own knowledge; actions, and reasoning; responds positively to feedback; seeks new ideas and understanding.

SUMMARY RATING: Please indicate your assessment of the student teacher's overall performance in comparison with other student teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		**Average**		**Exceptional**

COMMENTS: Please use this section to expand on the ratings, assess personal qualities or instructional skills not mentioned previously, describe student's interest and/or participation in other school activities, or discuss general attributes such as enthusiasm, initiative, resourcefulness, sense of humor, etc. Attach an additional page if necessary.

Evaluator's Signature_____Address_____

Evaluator's Name_____Date:_____

A copy of this evaluation is to be included in the student's placement file.
Please check if student may see this evaluation._____

FINAL STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

LEWIS AND CLARK TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Now that you have completed your student teaching, we would appreciate it if you would reflect on your entire teacher education program to evaluate how successfully we accomplished the goal of providing you with the knowledge and skills necessary to be a competent beginning teacher. Below are the competencies that the education faculty believe characterize an effective teacher. For each competency area, please indicate how successful the program was in preparing you. In some areas, we would like to know whether the program both:

A. provided an understanding of what that competency means and why it is important (the Theory),

-and-

B. provided the knowledge and skills to be effective in the classroom in that area (the Practice).

DIRECTIONS: For each competency please circle one choice:

VS if the program was	**VERY SUCCESSFUL**
S if the program was	**SUCCESSFUL**
NS if the program was	**NOT SUCCESSFUL**
NA if you feel this is something that cannot be taught in a teacher education program.	**NOT APPLICABLE**

Then for each competency, please comment on the strengths or weaknesses of the program in preparing you in this area.

Thank you for your time and your careful review of our program!

SAMPLE ITEM One of the competencies below looks like this:

5. Use a variety of instructional techniques.	**A. Theory**	**VS**	**S**	**NS**	**NA**
	B. Practice	**VS**	**S**	**NS**	**NA**

Comments:

For A. Theory, please indicate by circling the appropriate letters how successful the program was in providing you with the information on why variety is important.
For B. Practice, please indicate how successfully the program was in providing you with the knowledge and skills to use a variety of instructional techniques in the classroom.
Under **Comments,** please write any specific suggestions for the program and/or any particular strengths the program has demonstrated in the process of preparing you to be a beginning teacher.

KNOWLEDGE -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

1. Exhibit knowledge of subject field(s)?		VS	S	NS	NA
Present accurate information in a variety of ways; make reference to basic concepts, theories and methodologies; create linkages with other fields and social concerns; alert students to changing nature of subject field knowledge, to standards and values guiding inquiry, and to alternative interpretations.					
Comments:					
2. Use knowledge of field in a manner appropriate to age and ability of students?	A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
	B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA
Build vocabulary, concepts and methodological competence from students' current experience and level of understanding.					
Comments:					

INSTRUCTION -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

3. Plan and present curriculum to achieve specific goals which are consistent with state and district guidelines?	A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
	B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA
Determine and states goals; construct appropriate curriculum; organize activities, materials and methods of evaluation to achieve objectives; pace and sequence smoothly; use unexpected creatively.					
Comments:					
4. Engender student interest?	A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
Use current student knowledge and concerns; design activities which respond to developmental needs of students; take account of effects of physical, social, and emotional climate of home and community.	B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA
Comments:					
5. Use a variety of instructional techniques?	A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
Include a variety of methods and materials in achieving goals, both for interest and in recognition of varied learning styles.	B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA
Comments:					

6. Connect current instruction to prior learning of students?
Include frequent review and summary activities; monitor progress of student learning; use feedback to adjust instruction.

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

7. Teach to develop cognitive abilities of all students?
Emphasize higher order thinking in subject fields; model and promote creativity and critical thinking; use reading and writing as constructive processes underlying learning; use questions effectively.

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

8. Encourage independent, responsible learners?
Encourage students to understand and direct own cognitive processes; model enjoyment of thinking and learning; foster self-control in learning environment.

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

EVALUATION -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

9. Assess student achievement and provide appropriate feedback?
Use various methods of formal and informal assessment; tie procedures to objectives; use praise and other feedback to support learning; applies standards consistently and equitably; inform students and parents of student progress.

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

10. Attend to individual differences?
Display appropriately high expectations for all; accommodate cultural differences; adjust for exceptionalities; foster appreciation of contributions of different genders, cultures, abilities.

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

MANAGEMENT -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

11. Structure the classroom to support learning goals.
Employ management methods that encourage attentiveness, accuracy, effort, reasoning, time on task, cooperation; respond to misbehavior consistently and appropriately; involve students in shaping rules and establishing norms to support academic performance

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Comments:

INTERPERSONAL -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

12. Exhibit positive interpersonal relations with students, colleagues, and parents?

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Display positive, invitational behavior; be courteous and non-discriminatory; display open, helpful, reciprocal relations with colleagues and parents.

Comments:

13. Encourage positive interpersonal interactions among students?

A. Theory	VS	S	NS	NA
B. Practice	VS	S	NS	NA

Insist on respect for differences; encourage intercultural, gender and group harmony; involve students in maintaining positive interpersonal relations; accommodate students with different social skills; incorporate collaborative learning opportunities.

Comments:

PROFESSIONAL -- HAS THE PROGRAM HELPED YOU TO:

14. Develop a coherent educational philosophy which will promote an involvement in the profession? VS S NS NA

Refer to purposes and goals of education in planning and practice; have awareness of professional sources of assistance; articulate actions within wider context; be committed to improving education and own professional abilities.

Comments:

15. Exhibit reflection? VS S NS NA

Be aware of own strengths and weaknesses; display understanding of students' conceptions of self, world, and subject matter; recognize value basis of subject area knowledge; assess own knowledge, actions, and reasoning; respond positively to feedback; seek new ideas and understanding.

Comments:

SUMMARY RATING: Please indicate your overall assessment of the program's performance in preparing you.

COMMENTS:

1 Poor **2** **3 Satisfactory** **4** **5 Very good**

LEWIS AND CLARK TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Since you have just supervised one of our student teachers, we would like you to evaluate how successfully the Teacher Education Program at Lewis and Clark accomplished the goal of providing the knowledge and skills necessary to be a competent beginning teacher. Below are the competencies that the education faculty believe characterize an effective teacher. For each competency area, please indicate how successfully the program prepared your student teacher.

DIRECTIONS: For each competency please circle one choice:

VS if the program was	**VERY SUCCESSFUL**
S if the program was	**SUCCESSFUL**
NS if the program was	**NOT SUCCESSFUL**
NA if you feel this is something that cannot be taught in a teacher education program.	**NOT APPLICABLE**

Then for each competency, please comment on the strengths or weaknesses of the program in preparing preservice teacher candidates in this area.

Thank you for your time and your careful review of our program!

KNOWLEDGE -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

1. Exhibits knowledge of subject field(s)? VS S NS NA

Presents accurate information in a variety of ways; makes reference to basic concepts, theories and methodologies; creates linkages with other fields and social concerns; alerts students to changing nature of subject field knowledge, to standards and values guiding inquiry, and to alternative interpretations.

Comments:

2. Uses knowledge of field in a manner appropriate to age and ability of students? VS S NS NA

Builds vocabulary, concepts and methodological competence from students' current experience and level of understanding.

Comments:

INSTRUCTION -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

3. Plans and presents curriculum to achieve specific goals which are consistent with state and district guidelines? VS S NS NA
Determines and states goals; constructs appropriate curriculum; organizes activities, materials and methods of evaluation to achieve objectives; paces and sequences smoothly; uses unexpected creatively.
Comments:

4. Engenders student interest? VS S NS NA
Uses current student knowledge and concerns; designs activities which respond to developmental needs of students; takes account of effects of physical, social, and emotional climate of home and community.
Comments:

5. Uses a variety of instructional techniques? VS S NS NA
Includes a variety of methods and materials in achieving goals, both for interest and in recognition of varied learning styles.
Comments:

6. Connects current instruction to prior learning of students? VS S NS NA
Includes frequent review and summary activities; monitors progress of student learning; uses feedback to adjust instruction.
Comments:

7. Teaches to develop cognitive abilities of all students? VS S NS NA
Emphasizes higher order thinking in subject fields; models and promotes creativity and critical thinking; uses reading and writing as constructive processes underlying learning; uses questions effectively.
Comments:

8. Encourages independent, responsible learners? VS S NS NA

Encourages students to understand and direct own cognitive processes; models enjoyment of learning; fosters self-control in learning environment.

Comments:

EVALUATION -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

9. Assesses student achievement and provide appropriate feedback? VS S NS NA

Uses various methods of formal and informal assessment; ties procedures to objectives; uses praise and other feedback to support learning; applies standards consistently and equitably; informs students and parents of student progress.

Comments:

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES-HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

10. Attends to individual differences? VS S NS NA

Displays appropriately high expectations for all; accommodates cultural differences; adjusts for exceptionalities; fosters appreciation of contributions of different genders, cultures, abilities.

Comments:

MANAGEMENT -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

11. Structures the classroom to support learning goals. VS S NS NA

Employs management methods that enhance encourage attentiveness, accuracy, effort, reasoning, time on task, cooperation; respond to misbehavior consistently and appropriately; involves students in shaping rules and establishing norms to support academic performance.

Comments:

INTERPERSONAL -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

12. Exhibits positive interpersonal relations with students, colleagues, and parents? VS S NS NA

Displays positive, invitational behavior; is courteous and non-discriminatory; displays open, helpful, reciprocal relations with colleagues and parents.

Comments:

13. Encourages positive interpersonal interactions among students? VS S NS NA

Insists on respect for differences; encourages intercultural, gender and group harmony; involves students in maintaining positive interpersonal; accommodates students with different social skills; incorporates collaborative learning opportunities.

Comments:

PROFESSIONAL -- HAS THE PROGRAM PRODUCED A BEGINNING TEACHER WHO:

14. Demonstrates a coherent educational philosophy which will promote an involvement in the profession? VS S NS NA

Refers to purposes and goals of education in planning and practice; has awareness of professional sources of assistance; articulates actions within wider context; is committed to improving education and own professional abilities.

Comments:

15. Exhibits reflection? VS S NS NA

Is aware of own strengths and weaknesses; displays understanding of students' conceptions of self, world, and subject matter; assesses own knowledge; actions, and reasoning; responds positively to feedback; seeks new ideas and understanding.

Comments:

SUMMARY RATING: Please indicate your overall assessment of the program's performance in preparing your student teacher.

COMMENTS:

1 Poor **2** **3 Satisfactory** **4** **5 Very Good**